



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/751,841	01/02/2001	Ross Heitkamp	0023-0004	9281

44987 7590 02/28/2005  
HARRITY & SNYDER, LLP  
11240 WAPLES MILL ROAD  
SUITE 300  
FAIRFAX, VA 22030

EXAMINER

DANG, KHANH

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2111

DATE MAILED: 02/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No. 09/751,841	Applicant(s) HEITKAMP ET AL.	
	Examiner Khanh Dang	Art Unit 2111	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Khanh Dang. (3) \_\_\_\_.
- (2) Mr. Harrity (Atty of Record). (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 22 February 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.


Identification of prior art discussed: Khosrowpour et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: see attached.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



Khanh Dang  
Primary Examiner

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Applicants filed an Appeal Brief on 11/24/2004 appealing the Final Rejection issued on 4/23/2004. The main issue at question is whether or not is the language “begin to sample the destination address from the bus a plurality of clock cycles after commencement of the address interval” (claim 1) and similar language found in claims 17, 21, 23, and 26 distinguish claims 1, 17, and 26 over Khosrowpour et al.

After reviewing Applicants' Appeal Brief in order to prepare for the Examiner's Answer, it is noted that there is a newly presented argument in Applicants' Appeal Brief regarding the above mentioned main issue. While this new line of argument does not convince the Examiner that the language noted above define the invention over Khosrowpour et al., it does make Applicants' position more transparent compared to Applicants' argument in response to the Final Rejection. As a result, the Examiner, in an effort to advance prosecution, proposes an amendment to the claims at question, that will resolve main remaining issue.

In page 11, line 5 of the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph to line 1 of page 12, Applicants argue that “sampling of the address bits in Khosropour et al. may take a plurality of clock cycles—not that the sampling would begin a plurality of clock cycles after commencement of an address interval, as required by claim 1”. Similarly, in the 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph of page 12, Applicants argue that “Khosrowpour et al. does not disclose or suggest that the sampling of the address bits begins a plurality of clock cycles after commencement of the address interval, as required in claim 1.” However, the language “begin to sample the destination address from the bus a plurality of clock cycles after commencement of

Art Unit: 2111

the address interval,” as recited in claim 1, does not necessarily require that “sampling of the address bits begins a plurality of clock cycles after commencement of the address interval.” As discussed in details in the Final Rejection, the language “begin to sample the destination address from the bus a plurality of clock cycles after commencement of the address interval” (claim 1) is readable on Khosrowpour et al. employing the following interpretation set forth in the Final Rejection. At the outset, a clock cycle is the time between two adjacent pulses. In Khosrowpour, each slave device preferably includes a sample circuit for sampling each data bit when the sample circuit is enabled. Also, control logic detects the data pulse, enables the sample circuit for sampling the data bit, detects the clock pulse to disable the sample circuit and enable the memory, and detects the reset pulse for resetting the slave to receive another data bit. The memory of the slave device receives the data bits one at a time until filled with the address. Thus, it is clear that a clock cycle is terminated after the S/H sampled one bit and the reset pulse resets another clock cycle for another bit to be sampled. In Khosrowpour et al., the master sends a plurality of data bits forming a command, where each command includes at least one command bit and corresponding address bits. Since the address bits are represented by a plurality of bits, the S/H of the slave must sample the address bits from the bus a plurality of clock cycles.

In order to clearly define the invention, and to truly reflect Applicants’ position expressed in the Appeal Brief, the following is the Examiner’s proposed amendment to claim 1:

Art Unit: 2111

- -- a plurality of slave devices connected to the bus and configured to detect commencement of the bus cycles, begin to sample the destination address from the bus, the sampling begins a plurality of clock cycles after commencement of the address interval, and transmit or receive a command or data during the data interval. –

With regard to the 112 Rejection, the Examiner suggests that the use of a phrase such as “operatively connected” to provide necessary connections between elements in order to overcome the 112 Rejection.

The Examiner’s proposed amendments set forth above with regard to Khosrowpour et al. are also be applicable to the Dickson reference.

Applicants will file an RCE to incorporate the Examiner suggestion to resolve the main issues and to further cooperate with the Examiner to resolve any possible remaining minor issues to place the application in condition for allowance.



Khanh Dang  
Primary Examiner